

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
MARSHALL DIVISION**

HUAWEI TECHNOLOGIES CO. LTD.,

v.

VERIZON COMMUNICATIONS, INC.,  
ET AL§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§  
§

Case No. 2:20-cv-30-JRG

**MARKMAN HEARING MINUTES (VIDEO)  
HELD BEFORE DISTRICT JUDGE RODNEY GILSTRAP  
December 17, 2020**

**OPEN: 1:12 p.m.****ADJOURN: 4:27 p.m.**

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF:	Greg Love Justin Nemunaitis Hamad Hamad Seth Wright Alex Waldrop Steven Geizler
ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS:	Deron Dacus Charles Verhoeven Deepa Archarya Brian Mack Brian Watkins Pat Stafford Patrick Curran Michael Holden Mark Zeigelbein David Barkan Sanjeev Mehata Norman Minnear
TECHNICAL ADVISOR:	Don Tiller
LAW CLERK:	Adrienne Dellinger
COURT REPORTER:	Shelly Holmes, CSR-TCRR
COURTROOM DEPUTY:	Jan Lockhart

TIME	MINUTES
9:00 a.m.	Court opened counsel announced ready for hearing
	The Court heard argument on “data blocks containing data only” / “data block group containing data blocks only”. Ms. Archarya argued for Defendant. Mr. Nemunaitis argued for Plaintiff.(‘433)
	The Court heard argument on “control block buffer” / “data block buffer”. Ms. Archarya argued for Defendants. Mr. Nemunaitis argued for Plaintiff.

TIME	MINUTES
	The Court heard argument on “the mapping the single low-rate traffic signal to the single low-rate traffic OPU is performed using a General Framing Procedure (GFP) or other adaptation protocols ” Ms. Archarya argued for Defendants. Mr. Nemunaitis argued for Plaintiff. (‘151)
	The Court heard argument on “rate rank”. Ms. Archarya argued for Defendants. Mr. Nemunaitis argued for Plaintiff. (‘151)
2:08 p.m.	The Court heard argument on “time slot”. Mr. Stafford argued on behalf of Defendants. Mr. Nemunaitis argued on behalf of Plaintiff. (‘982)
	The Court heard argument on “client signal byte number Cn”. Mr. Hamad argued for Plaintiff. Mr. Verhoeven argued for Defendants. (‘236).
2:40 p.m.	The Court heard argument on “if the Cn transported in the OTN frame needs to be [increased / decreased]” / “the Cn transported in the OTN frame doesn’t need to be increased or decreased”. (‘236) Mr. Verhoeven argued for Defendants. Mr. Hamad argued for Plaintiff.
2:53 p.m.	Recess for 10 minutes.
3:05 p.m.	The Court heard argument on “Optical Channel Data Tributary Unit (ODTU) [frame]”/”ODTU [frame]” Mr. Hamad argued for Plaintiff. Mr. Verhoeven argued for Defendants.(‘505).
	The Court heard argument on “n-bit data units” / n indicating the number of the multiple OPUk TSs” (‘505) Mr. Hamad argued for Plaintiff. Mr. Verhoeven argued for Defendants.
	<p>The Court heard argument on “judging . . . whether the identifier contained in the fault alarm message is different from a fault identifier record stored in the second node” (claim 1)</p> <p>“judge . . . whether the identifier extracted from the fault alarm message is different from the fault information stored in the fault information storing module” (claim 4)</p> <p>“judge . . . whether the identifier contained in the fault alarm message is different from a fault identifier record stored in the second node” (claim 6)</p> <p>“determining . . . whether the identifier contained in the fault alarm message is different from a fault identifier record stored in the first node” (claim 9)</p> <p>“determine whether the identifier contained in the fault alarm message is different from a fault identifier record stored in the first node” (claim 14) (‘253).</p> <p>Mr. Watkins argued on behalf of Defendants. Mr. Waldrop argued for Plaintiff.</p>
3:50 p.m.	<p>The Court heard argument on “wherein the first time stamp comprises information reflecting a round trip delay of the network” (‘111) (6, 16, 22, 30)</p> <p>“wherein the information of the first time stamp reflects a round trip delay of a network” (12)(‘288)</p> <p>“wherein the information reflects a round trip delay of a network;” (1, 26) (‘111). Mr. Reich argued for Plaintiff. Mr. Mack argued for Defendant. (‘288)</p>
4:24 p.m.	The Court took all disputed terms under submission.
4:27 p.m.	Court adjourned.